

Remarks

Applicant appreciates the kind attention provided by Examiner William A. Rivera during the interview on May 3, 2007.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application, of which claims 1-17 have been rejected. By this paper, Applicant cancels claims 1-10, 12 and 18, and amends claims 11, 13, 15 and 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maxey (U.S. Patent No. 4,275,424). By this paper, Applicant has canceled claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12.

Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and therefore no new issues have been raised by the amendment to claim 13. As discussed in the interview, claim 13 includes limitations that are not disclosed in Maxey. Specifically, claim 13 requires “said tape path including a portion that starts at said first pair of flanged guides and ends at said second pair of flanged guides; and said portion of said tape path being symmetrical about said axis.” Referring to Figure 9 of Maxey, the portion of the tape path that starts at rollers 126b, 130b and ends at rollers 130b, 128b is not symmetrical about the longitudinal axis. Therefore, as agreed in the interview, claim 13 is not anticipated by Maxey.

Claims 11, 14 and 15 depend from claim 13 and therefore are not anticipated for the reasons stated above with reference to claim 13. Since claim 13 is in allowable form, no new issues have been raised by amending claims 11 and 15 to depend from claim 13.

Claim 17 includes a similar limitation that requires “said tape path including a portion that starts at said first pair of said flanged guides and ends at said second pair of flanged guides; and said portion of said tape path being symmetrical about said axis.” As discussed above with reference to claim 13, the tape portion of Maxey in Figure 9 is not symmetrical about the longitudinal axis and therefore claim 17 is not anticipated by Maxey.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxey and further in view of Saitou (U.S. Patent No. 4,367,859) or Hoover et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,443,827). Claim 4 has been canceled by this paper.

Claims 8, 16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxey and further in view of Poorman (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0087738). Claims 8 and 18 have been canceled by this paper. Claim 16 has been amended to depend from claim 13, which is allowable as discussed above and therefore claim 16 is allowable for depending from an allowed claim. Since claim 13 is in allowable form, no new issues have been raised by amending claim 16 to depend from claim 13.

Conclusion

Once again, Applicant appreciates the kind attention the Examiner provided to put the present application in allowable form, which allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Underkofler

By /Michael D. Turner/
Michael D. Turner
Reg. No. 52,306
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 05/03/2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351